

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,544	PALIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Perez M. Angelica	Art Unit 2618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Perez M. Angelica. (3) _____.

(2) Joseph C. Redmond (18,753). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6/10/07

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cho and Auckland.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner agreed with the applicant's representative that the Cho reference is not proper prior art. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the reference and conduct a new search. If new art is found that reads on the limitations of the claims, the Examiner will have to give another final action. The applicant's representative will have the option to argue to the Final Action or to further amend the claims to overcome the new prior art. The Auckland reference was discussed and the Examiner agreed that the reference does not disclose exchanging communications at UWB frequencies or higher.